

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 have been cancelled. New claims 22-42 have been added. Claims 22-42 are pending.

The claims have been amended in a manner believed to render moot the provisional rejection of claims 1, 8, and 15 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting.

The claims have been amended in a manner believed to render moot the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Sundararajan (U.S. Patent 6,487,577).

New claim 22 recites that the request includes “a symbolic task name and a collection reference expression” and that the collection “includes collection specifier information and collection content information.” Support for this claim may be found, without limitation, on page 3 of the application. Sundararajan describes transmitting a job that is “typically binary data which describes a task to be performed. In the preferred embodiment, a job is a binary large object (BLOB) that is tagged with a job type identification so that the NRS computer knows the type of job being submitted. The job type identification can be referenced in a field of a database to provide the SC computer with information on steps to be executed to complete the job.” Sundararajan does not describe symbolic task names, collection reference expressions, collection specifier information, and collection content information as described in claim 22. Claim 22 is therefore believed to be allowable.

New claims 23-28 depend from claim 22 and are believed to be allowable for the reasons described above.

New claim 29 similarly recites “a symbolic task name and a collection reference expression” and that the collection “includes collection specifier information and collection content information” and is believed to be allowable for the reasons described above.

New claims 30-35 depend from claim 29 and are believed to be allowable for the reasons described above.

New claim 36 similarly recites “a symbolic task name and a collection reference expression” and that the collection “includes collection specifier information and collection content information” and is believed to be allowable for the reasons described above.

New claims 37-42 depend from claim 36 and are believed to be allowable for the reasons described above.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 11/20/2004



Robyn Wagner
Registration No. 50,575
V 408-973-2596
F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200
Cupertino, CA 95014